1	MARK J. CONNOT (10010)		
2	COLLEEN E. MCCARTY (13186) FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP		
3	1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Ste. 700 Las Vegas, NV 89135 Telephone: 702.262.6899 Facsimile: 702.597.5503		
4			
5	mconnot@foxrothschild.com cmccarty@foxrothschild.com		
6	Counsel for Defendants Zachary K. Bradford, Lori L. Love, S. Matthew Schultz, Robert P. Beynon, Larry McNeill, and Thomas L. Wood, and Nominal Defendant Classes are the		
7	Thomas L. Wood, and Nominal Defendant Cleanspark, Inc.		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
10	BRANDON SMITH, Derivatively on Behalf of		
11	CLEANSPARK, INC., Plaintiff,	Case No.:	
12	Traintiff,	Case 110	
13	V.		
14	ZACHARY K. BRADFORD, LORI L. LOVE, S. MATTHEW SCHULTZ, LARRY	PETITION FOR REMOVAL	
15	MCNEILL, THOMAS L. WOOD, and ROGER P. BEYNON,		
16	Defendants,		
17	-and-		
18	CLEANSPARK, INC., a Nevada Corporation,		
19	Nominal Defendant.		
20			
21	Without submitting to the jurisdiction of this Court and without waiving any available		
22	defenses, including without limitation, lack of jurisdiction, improper venue, or insufficient		
23	service of process, defendants Zachary K. Bradford, Lori L. Love, S. Matthew Schultz, Larry		
24	McNeill, Thomas L. Wood, and Roger P. Beynon (the "Individual Defendants"), by and through		
25	their undersigned counsel, hereby remove this action from the Eighth Judicial District Court of		
26	the State of Nevada, County of Clark, where it is currently pending, to this Court. As required		
27		ndants set forth below a short and plain statement	
20	of the grounds for removal.		

- 1. On or about March 1, 2023, Plaintiff Brandon Smith ("Plaintiff"), derivatively on behalf of nominal defendant, CleanSpark, Inc. (the "Company," and together with the Individual Defendants, the "Defendants"), commenced an action entitled *Smith v. Bradford et al.*, Case No. A-23-866051-C, in Department 8 of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada, County of Clark, by the filing of a Verified Complaint (the "Complaint").
- 2. The Complaint relies heavily on a January 14, 2021 "report" by an anonymous short-seller called "Culper Research" and two previously-filed lawsuits: (i) a derivative action pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, *In re CleanSpark, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, No. 21-cv-01004 (GMN) (the "Derivative Action"), and (ii) a securities class action pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, *Bishins v. CleanSpark, Inc. et al.*, No. 21-cv-511 (LAP), (the "Class Action" and together with the Derivative Action, the "Prior Actions"). The allegations in the Complaint are virtually identical to the allegations in the complaints filed in the Prior Actions.
- 3. Specifically, the Complaint alleges that certain of the Company's officers and directors breached their fiduciary duties to the Company and its shareholders by purportedly making false or misleading misstatements or omissions concerning: (i) the Company's due diligence of a bitcoin mining company it acquired called ATL Data Centers, Inc. ("ATL"), (ii) the nature and history of ATL's bitcoin mining assets, and (iii) the Company's ability to implement the "first phase" of improving the ATL facility in accordance with its publicly disclosed timeline. (Complaint ¶¶ 5–7, 9–12).
- 4. Plaintiff alleges that the Company was purportedly damaged by the foregoing acts or omissions. (Complaint ¶¶ 166, 169).
- 5. The Notice of Removal is being filed by the Individual Defendants within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a copy of the Complaint and is timely filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441, 1446.
 - 6. The Individual Defendants, including any individual defendant that is a citizen of

¹ Defendants reject the statements in this so-called "report," which is a transparent effort by an admitted short-seller to depress the Company's stock price for its own benefit.

1	Nevada, verbally agreed to accept service of the Complaint on March 7, 2023. Nominal	
2	Defendant CleanSpark, Inc. was served on February 28, 2023.	
3	7. The Individual Defendants' time to move, answer, or otherwise respond to the	
4	Complaint has not expired.	
5	8. This Court has jurisdiction over this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a	
6	Plaintiff's claims turn on substantial questions of federal law. See Grable & Sons Metal Prod.,	
7	Inc. v. Darue Eng'g & Mfg., 545 U.S. 308 (2005); Gunn v. Minton, 586 U.S. 251 (2013).	
8	9. Written notice of the filing of the Notice of Removal shall be given to Plaintiff,	
9	and the Individual Defendants shall file the notice with the Clerk of the Eighth Judicial District	
10	Court of the State of Nevada, County of Clark, as required by law.	
11	10. Defendants have not answered, moved, or otherwise responded to the Complaint	
12	and no other proceedings have occurred heretofore in this action.	
13	11. No previous application for the relief requested herein has been made previously	
14	12. Attached as Exhibit 1 to this Petition is a true and correct copy of the Verified	
15	Stockholder Derivative Complaint for Breach of Fiduciary Duty and Unjust Enrichment, which	
16	comprises all of the pleadings in this matter.	
17	WHEREFORE, the Individual Defendants give notice that the matter bearing Case No.	
18	A-23-866051-C, in Department 8 of the Eighth Judicial District Court of the State of Nevada,	
19	County of Clark, is removed to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, and	
20	request that this Court retain jurisdiction for all further proceedings in this matter.	
21	DATED: March 23, 2023 FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP	
22	/s/ Colleen E. McCarty	
23	MARK J. CONNOT (10010) COLLEEN E. MCCARTY (13186)	
24	1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Ste. 700	
25	Las Vegas, NV 89135 mconnot@foxrothschild.com	
	cmccarty@foxrothschild.com	
26	Counsel for Defendant Zachary K. Bradford, Lori L. Love, S. Matthew Schultz, Robert P.	
2728	Beynon, Larry McNeill, and Thomas L. Wood and Nominal Defendant Cleanspark, Inc.	

Case 2:23-cv-00445-GMN-BNW Document 1 Filed 03/23/23 Page 4 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that I am an employee of Fox Rothschild LLP and that on the 23rd day of March 2023, pursuant to Rule 5(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing PETITION FOR REMOVAL via electronic transmission. /s/ Deborah L. Pressley An employee of Fox Rothschild LLP